# Draft

# California Statewide Historic Preservation Plan 2006-2010

## INTRODUCTION

Many observers would agree that the historic preservation movement is stronger now than at any other time in California's history. The California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) benefits from partnerships with stakeholders at federal, state, and local government levels and with numerous non-profit and for-profit organizations working together to promoting historic preservation. This successful partnering is reflected in several ways. The number of Certified Local Governments – local governmental partners with OHP – has increased steadily and now stands at 51. OHP has also entered into numerous programmatic agreements with federal and state agencies such as the U.S. Department of Defense and California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, delegating authority to these agencies to perform many project review activities by hiring qualified professionals. The Office maintains longstanding partnerships with non-profit advocacy groups throughout the state such as the California Preservation Foundation, Society for California Archaeology, and California Council for the Promotion of History; new partnerships are being formed each year in different regions of the state and with new and different audiences.

Despite this progress, our cultural heritage is still at risk. On a regular basis, parts of our heritage – from historic buildings to bridges to archaeological sites – are destroyed. The primary purpose of this Comprehensive Statewide Historic Preservation Plan (State Plan) is to provide guidance to OHP and the preservation community for the identification, registration, protection, and preservation of important historic resources, and to establish priorities for the use of limited resources available for the program.

This State Plan is a requirement for California's participation in the larger federal historic preservation program and financial support from the Historic Preservation Fund. Section 101 (b)(3)(c) of the National Historic Preservation Act instructs the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) to "prepare and implement a comprehensive statewide historic preservation plan." National Park Service (NPS) guidelines for this program list the general requirements of such a plan: "(1) meets the circumstances of each State; (2) achieves broad-based public and professional involvement throughout the State; (3) takes into consideration issues affecting the broad spectrum of historic and cultural resources within the State; (4) is based on the analyses of resource data and user needs; (5) encourages the consideration of historic preservation within broader planning environments at the Federal, State, and local levels; and (6) is implemented by SHPO operation."

Over the years, the California OHP has prepared several versions of its State Plan. The initial effort was *The California History Plan*, prepared in 1973. It was a joint document, concerning the operations of State Historical Parks by the California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks) as well as the external historic preservation program of OHP. [OHP has always been a branch of State Parks.] This plan was first updated in 1997, in a publication prepared exclusively by and for the use of OHP, entitled, *Forging a Future with a Past: Comprehensive Statewide Historic Preservation Plan for California*. That plan was updated further in 2000 with publication of

*Comprehensive Statewide Historic Preservation Plan for California, 2000-2005.* At the time of the 2000 update, the California OHP and the NPS agreed to a schedule for updating California's plan on a five-year cycle. The present publication represents California's update for the next five years, 2006-2010.

This plan establishes priorities for OHP for the next five years, helping to direct resources to areas of greatest need and to objectives for which the office has the greatest likelihood of success. OHP does not consider the goals and objectives contained within the State Plan to be in opposition to or in the place of the core activities OHP pursues today and has pursued for many years: registration; coordination with Certified Local Governments; review of federal and federally-funded or permitted projects; maintenance of an inventory of historical resources; and so forth. These core activities represent the essential mission of the office and must be performed, without or without this State Plan. Rather, the State Plan is seen as a roadmap for more effective and efficient delivery of these core activities, helping OHP meet its core responsibilities in ways that better serve the preservation needs of the people of California.

## STATE PLAN PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY

This State Plan update was prepared by the staff of OHP, but in consultation with the state's preservation community and the general public. In preparing this State Plan, the office relied upon four major groups for input and exchange of data and ideas. The core group that developed the State Plan was a six-person State Plan Committee within OHP, including Stephen D. Mikesell, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, state historians Marie Nelson and John Thomas, state archaeologist Michael McGuirt, information technologist Eric Allison, and fiscal analyst Dennis Weber. The second group was the office at large, including all 30 full-time staff. The third group comprises the public at large, which was consulted early and often throughout this process. The final group was the State Historical Resources Commission, the "state review board" for California and OHP's policy commission and link to the public.

The process for developing this State Plan followed six major steps. The first step involved internal planning within the office, drawing upon the expertise of some of the most knowledgeable historic preservation experts in the state and establishing the aforementioned six-member State Plan Committee to guide the Plan. Then, to tap that font of expertise at OHP, an all day "brainstorming session" was scheduled to explore the preservation challenges, topics, and issues that should be addressed in the State Plan.

As a second step OHP reached out to preservation partners and the general public to help identify the issues of greatest concern to them. OHP developed a web page describing the state plan process and seeking public input. An eight question *State Plan Needs Assessment Survey* was posted on OHP's web site. In addition to mention of the State Plan process and survey on OHP's website and the State of California's portal site, survey responses were solicited through email announcements to nearly 200

professional, historic preservation and or local history organizations. Several of these organizations alerted their membership to the survey through emails or announcements in their electronic or print newsletters.

The responses to the planning "page" and the questionnaire were quite impressive. The public made nearly three thousand "hits" on the planning page each month during the planning process. The questionnaire was available for about 45 days, during which time 528 questionnaires were completed.

The questionnaire provided various types of data that were invaluable in preparing this plan. A copy of the questionnaire is attached as **Appendix 1**; summary statistics from the responses to the questionnaire are included as **Appendix 2**. One set of questions pertained to the programs administered directly by OHP (Tax Act, Section 106, CLG, and so forth), asking respondents to rank these according to their own priorities. A second set of questions pertained to activities typically performed by others but which the office might support, such as the development of local preservation ordinances or promotion of heritage tourism. A third set asked the respondent to rank threats to historic resources (suburban sprawl, downtown redevelopment, and so forth). A fourth set pertained to preservation tools (local ordinances, revolving loan funds, and so forth), asking the respondent to rank these according to effectiveness. Two additional questions asked about the types of publications and training OHP might provide, while a final question asked the respondent to identify him or herself by profession, location, and ethnicity.

In addition to the questionnaire, members of the State Plan Committee attended conferences of historic preservation professionals, including the California Preservation Foundation, the Society for California Archaeology, and the California Council for the Promotion of History, making presentations on the progress of plan development and soliciting public input on plan elements.

In a third step, OHP prepared a list of "issues" deserving treatment in the State Plan, combining the results of the questionnaire with concerns raised by OHP staff. This proposed list of "issues" was presented at a public hearing of the State Historical Resources Commission at its meeting of November 2004; it was also presented in draft form at the October 2004 meeting of the California Council for the Promotion of History.

In a fourth step, OHP staff drafted background papers for each of the ten priority issues, assessing the current concerns and providing a foundation for the development of goals and objective. These draft papers were presented for comments to the public and the State Historical Resources Commission and posted on OHP's web site.

In a fifth step, in response to comments received regarding the preliminary draft papers, OHP developed an Initial Draft Plan which was presented to the public at a meeting of the State Historical Resources Commission in May 2005. The Draft Plan was also posted on OHP web site and comments were solicited from the general public*. (Add to this later.)*

In a sixth step, OHP presented a copy of the Final Plan to the State Historical Resources Commission at its meeting in November 2005, prior to formal submission to the NPS. *(add to this later.)*

## CALIFORNIA'S CULTURAL RESOURCES
## THE PRESENT STATE OF THE PAST

Californians are often reminded of superlatives associated with their state and its people: if it were an independent nation, it would have the sixth largest economy in the world; if superimposed on the East Coast of the United States, it would extend from Connecticut to Georgia; its population is among the most culturally diverse of any of the states; and so forth. The historic resources are as diverse and impressive as its natural and social resources. Indeed, the historic resources of California are so diverse as to defy most available systems for categorization and analysis.

A notable recent attempt to capture the full measure of California's diverse heritage is the recent "California History Plan," prepared by OHP's parent agency, California State Parks. By an accident of timing, OHP was preparing this Comprehensive Statewide Historic Preservation Plan, at the same time that State Parks was updating its California History Plan. The California History Plan is designed chiefly to guide the Department in the acquisition of new historic parks as well as in the interpretation of historic parks already owned by the State.

While the plans were created for different purposes, the California History Plan and the Statewide Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan informed one another. The California History Plan is similar in structure to history plans developed by Parks Canada and the NPS, for its National Historic Landmark program. In each of these plans – Parks Canada, the NHL, and the CHP – priorities for action were identified through a thematic or conceptual framework, followed by a "gaps analysis." The history (including prehistory) of the region (Canada, the United States, or California) was analyzed according to major themes. Known populations of historic resources – NHLs, for example, or California State Historic Parks – were then classified according to these themes to identify "gaps" in coverage. The existence of these gaps may then be used to develop priorities for acquiring new parks or interpreting existing parks.

The work of State Parks provided a rich analytic framework to appreciate both the continuities and discontinuities within the body of heritage resources of the state, within the State Park System and elsewhere. The thematic approach complements the more traditional chronological approach, taken in earlier frameworks by State Parks as well as the NPS. The older chronological frameworks, while useful in analyzing change over time, tended to compartmentalize and minimize the enduring impacts of Native Americans. Native Americans were the exclusive human inhabitants of the state before 1769, as well as people of Spanish and Mexican descent, who exercised sovereignty between the late 1760s and the mid-1840s. In a thematic approach, the various people

of California – the Native Americans, Mexicans, and the hosts of European, Asian, and other peoples who came later – may be interpreted for their longstanding contributions to the culture, economy, and society of the state.

The 2004 California History Plan was designed, not only to assess the diversity of the state's heritage but also to gauge the degree to which the various categories of resources have been preserved in public parks (state parks as well as federal and local parks). The plan concludes that certain thematic groups of resources are well represented among publicly owned facilities, particularly those resources associated with the early Spanish and Mexican settlements and the Gold Rush. It concludes as well that other thematic groups are represented to a far lesser degree. Of special importance in the latter regard are resources associated with the state's important agricultural heritage as well as resources associated with the state's longstanding association with "high tech" industries, whatever the leading edge technologies may have been over time. The State Park plan also identified prehistoric archaeological properties as decidedly underrepresented within the physical holdings and interpretive program of the system. The results of this "gap analysis" will help guide the department's acquisition and interpretation program as funds are made available for those purposes.

The California History Plan was designed specifically to guide acquisition and interpretation activities of the State Park System and cannot be presumed to apply beyond that system. Over time, however, it is anticipated that other public agencies (including OHP) will adopt the findings of the California History Plan as a mechanism for assessing the range of historic properties in the state and for assessing "gaps" in the purview of agencies other than State Parks. The U.S. Forest Service Region 5, for example, has attempted to apply the thematic framework as a means of prioritizing its survey and interpretive program. The California Department of Transportation has examined the thematic framework as a basis for prioritizing its research designs for historical archaeological data recovery programs. Discussions are underway to dovetail the History Plan and its thematic framework with the California history curriculum of the Department of Education.

Although it is a robust analytic tool, even the California History Plan cannot capture the full range of historic properties that exist in the state nor the passion with which Californians embrace those resources. That diversity is best grasped in impressions, such as those provided in a sample of historic properties listed in the National Register or as State Landmarks in the year 2004: a 1915 Sikh Temple in Stockton; St. Joseph's Church in rural Los Banos, with a predominantly Portuguese parish; the Courthouse in tiny Alpine County (population 1200 in the entire county); Le Conte Hall at the University of California, Berkeley (where Ernest Lawrence built his first cyclotron as part of the Manhattan Project); the home of Dr. Raymond Babcock in rural Willits (Mr. Babcock was doctor for the racehorse Seabiscuit and his owner, Charles Howard); a historic district in Palo Alto of the post-war tract homes of Alfred Eichler; Golden Gate Park in San Francisco, one of the largest cultural landscape nominations ever prepared; the Monterey County Jail, where Cesar Chavez was incarcerated during the lettuce strike of 1970; and, in the Los Angeles suburb of Hawthorne, the boyhood home of Brian, Carl,

and Dennis Wilson, who formed the core of the Beach Boys. All of these resources are quintessentially Californian and yet they offer only fleeting glimpses of the longstanding pageant of California history. The full picture emerges only when thousands of such resources have been preserved and interpreted. That, ultimately, is the objective of this State Plan, to encourage preservation of enough of California's historic resources that the rich history of the state may be fully appreciated.

## STATE PLAN ISSUES

OHP recognizes that the needs of historic preservation in California far exceed available human and financial resources. The State Plan process mandated by the National Park Service anticipates this condition, in California and in all other states and territories. The State Plan process is built around a two-stage process for establishing priorities for the use of available resources. In the first stage, states and territories are asked to identify the "issues," or general policy areas, that warrant priority considerations. In the second state, states and territories are asked to identify goals and objectives that can implement responses to those priority issues over a five-year period. What follows are discussions of the nine issue areas and the goals and objectives associated with each.

## I. ARCHAEOLOGY

*This section is still being written*

## II. CULTURAL DIVERSITY

California has witnessed the growth and development of the most diverse collection of peoples and cultures found anywhere in the world. California is among the first states where more than half the population in non-white. More than any other state California's history and historic fabric is a layering of cultures beginning with Native Americans and followed by waves of immigrants from around the world attracted by the state's resources. This phenomenon has produced a multicultural society that is representative of nearly every ethnic, racial, cultural, social, and religious group on earth.

The unique make-up of California, geography, resources, and economy, has pulled new peoples drawn by family ties, improved wages, demand for labor and better opportunities for work and education.

California's culture and history will continue to evolve. There are now more than 35 million people residing in the state and the ethnic mix have changed rapidly over its history. By 2040 Latinos will become the dominant culture in California with more than 18 million living in California. Asians will also gain significantly to more than 9 million. Most of these gains are tied to immigration since the 1980s and high birth rates among immigrant populations. As time passes, these cultures, primarily from Mexico, Latin American and Pacific Rim counties, will leave their own historic mark on California and preservation of their unique contributions will be required.

The publication of Five Views, An Ethnic Survey of California in 1988 was a landmark effort by the California Office of Historic Preservation to address cultural diversity in historic preservation. Five Views was originally conceived in order to broaden the spectrum of ethnic community participation in historic preservation activities and to provide better information on ethnic history and associated sites. This information helps planners identify and evaluate ethnic properties, which have generally been underrepresented on historic property surveys.

Most of all, the public needed the opportunity to become more aware of California's cultural diversity and its tangible manifestations on the land. Five Views chose the five largest minorities present during the 50 years after 1848. Today such a survey could be expanded to 50 or more views.

In any case, it is important to remember that the report was only a beginning, one step in an ongoing process. It raises more questions than it answers.

Most surveys record architecturally distinguished or widely known buildings, but ethnic properties are often include structures that are important because of people or events less familiar to many. Approximately one percent of the state historic resources inventory is associated with ethnic or cultural significance. This likely reflects both failures to target culturally diverse resources and to look for ethnic significance when conducting surveys. The City of Los Angeles has identified 15 Historic Preservation Overlay Zones and all are in lower or middle income neighborhoods of high ethnic density.

Cultural diversity has been an issue identified in the State's Comprehensive Statewide Historic Preservation Plan since 1995. Since publication of Five Views few inroads have been made to address the issue. Identification of properties linked to culturally diverse groups has not significantly increased and efforts to encourage participation in historic preservation by ethnic groups have been limited.

California's Native American population represents the group with the longest linkages to the state's historical past. California has a significant number of archeological sites, objects, and places with special meaning for Native Americans. Existing statutes and regulations, though improved in recent years, continue to provide little or no guidance as to how to incorporate the interests of Native American groups into planning. This has resulted in the general public's failure to fully understand the connection between prehistoric and present day Native Americans.

Other ethnic and cultural groups have properties and sites with significance to California's historic past. Like Native Americans, however, few of these groups have been adequately consulted or involved in the preservation of the properties associated with their historic pasts. California, as the premier example of a multicultural society on the U.S. mainland, must encourage greater involvement of the state's diverse ethnic and other marginalized groups in historic preservation activities. In addition, there needs to be a greater understanding of the contributions of all cultures to California by the dominant Anglo society. Every new culture that comes to California leaves a historic imprint on the language, art, architecture, and other aspects of the state's cultural.

The need to continue to include cultural diversity as an issue in the state plan is fortified not by public clamor, but rather continued silence and omission. In a 2004 electronic survey conducted by the California State Historic Preservation Office only 11 percent of respondents identified themselves as ethnics and only of 14 of 311 written comments received addressed cultural diversity. These results suggest a lack of successful outreach to these groups.

Yet there is strong interest in preserving ethnic cultural history according to the survey. Nearly 20 percent of respondents identified supporting coordinating efforts with federally recognized Native American tribes as an activity for the Office to focus resources on in the next five years. More than 27 percent of respondents cited recognition of historic resources associated with ethnically and culturally diverse groups as an activity the

Office should promote. Overall, 62 percent of respondents indicated that a lack of awareness of historical resources was a threat to the properties in their area.

In Los Angeles, Historic Overlay neighborhoods have observed that if they can manage their community planning, then safety, security, education and economic solutions begin to follow. Preservation then becomes integral to planning and community development and the political world responds. Interest in preservation advances beyond the views of small group to both the mainstream cultures and the thoughts of the ethnic population.

Additionally, various communities define their history and culture in unique ways. This creates complex problems involving social, legal and political consideration. The challenge for the Office of Historic Preservation is to recognize effective means of making all cultures real partners in the preservation of their particular heritage. Historic preservation does not mean the same to all cultures.

Efforts have been made by the Office of Historic Preservation over the past decade to build on Five Views. Preference has been given to Certified Local Government surveys that emphasize cultural diversity. Culturally diverse projects have been honored annually with Governor's Historic Preservation Awards. The Office of Historic Preservation has conducted greater outreach to Native American groups and has an assigned staff liaison. The Yurok Tribe has become one of the Information Centers helping managing the state's historic inventory records for the North Coast. Minority students have been selected for internships. But limited resources within the Office of Historic Preservation have hindered greater efforts.

Looking to the next five years, additional funding and staff to address the cultural diversity issue are not likely to increase. The task for the Office of Historic Preservation is to address the problem using innovation and technology while working within existing resources. These efforts, while incremental, can sew the seeds of a more culturally diverse approach to historic preservation in California.

## III. CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

Population inroads on formerly rural areas around major cities, revitalization and infill in formerly declining city core areas, heritage tourism, a growing interest in people-oriented city planning, an understanding of the important role of agriculture and industry in America’s and California’s development, and the various cultural experiences of Native groups and immigrants all have a connection to identifying, understanding, evaluating and protecting cultural landscapes and their components.

California preservationists have been at least minimally aware of culturally significant landscapes for quite some time although they probably weren’t always thinking of them in the terms they do today. Forestiere Underground Gardens in Fresno, Malakoff Diggins in Nevada County and the town of Bodie were all listed in the National Register in the 1960s and 70s. Each of them represents a “cultural landscape” that today would

be easily recognized as such. Their significance was indeed recognized, but probably not articulated or understood in the same way it would be today. The property types they represented were not generally acknowledged for what they were – a complex set of geographical relationships reflecting the impact of cultural and economic forces on the land.

Just as rampant post World War II "redevelopment" gave birth to the modern preservation era beginning in 1966, it has been noted that the proliferation of "sprawl" awakened the more recent recognition of landscapes as an important and critically endangered resource type. As California's new subdivisions and ever-spiraling land values devoured "underdeveloped" land, cultural, and natural, landscapes came increasingly under attack. Their disappearance brought a new awareness of their value and precarious state.

The National Park Service was early on a leader in landscape preservation studies and practice. In 1984 the NPS published *Cultural Landscapes: Rural Historic Districts in the National Park System*. It would go on to hold conferences, establish the Historic Landscape Initiative (now with website), and publish National Register Bulletins and Preservation Briefs dealing with the subject. NPS publishes *Cultural Landscape Currents* which discusses case studies of successful landscape management, and *Vineyards*, which is the Initiative's "occasional record" and newsletter.

The Park Service listed or found National Register eligible a number of cultural landscapes in the National Park System. In comparison, state and local governments and the private sector have lagged behind. Even while sophistication on the subject has grown considerably, the actual preservation of landscapes has proven more problematic for others than it has for the NPS. One important reason is that the National Park Service owns and holds for preservation purposes the cultural landscapes it has recognized. Outside the NPS, landowners both private and public are not always so willing to encumber their property with recognition that may affect the economic management or disposition of their land.

And California poses some unique problems that make the protection of cultural landscapes more challenging than elsewhere. Nationally, non-federal successes in the field of cultural landscape preservation tend to be located in rustbelt areas or other places of declining land value. There, preserving cultural landscapes-- industrial districts, for example-- may more readily be seen as a route to commercial development and increased land values. In California, a strong sense of property rights combined with high real estate costs and development pressures has made this type of success a much more formidable challenge.

Some local communities have been successful incorporating landscape properties and features into their preservation activities. Most commonly, large parks, landmark trees and tree-lined avenues have been protected in Fresno, Fullerton, San Francisco, Ontario, Upland, South Pasadena, Redondo Beach and other California cities. A few cities are attempting to go further. Fresno has proposed that its General Plan be

amended to allow for retaining “mature trees, historic and cultural landscapes.” County governments, likely to be the location of large culturally significant land areas, have not, as a rule, been active in their preservation.

Traditional cultural properties sacred to Native people, are a landscape type currently in a state of evolution. Traditional cultural properties often involve a large land area, and determining acceptable boundaries often poses substantial conflicts. Land managers and governmental agencies may need to focus on more limited areas for recognition and protection based on practical planning needs. Native people may not agree with imposing “practical” limits or bureaucratic frameworks, such as the National Register criteria, on concepts they regard as transcending human legalisms. And while traditional cultural properties were most often an issue involved in federal undertakings, with the recent passage of SB 18, local governments are now required to consult with Native Americans regarding important tribal places and to integrate that information into land use planning.

Economically-derived landscapes such as industrial or mining sites may not be recognized because they may not be perceived as aesthetically attractive. Historic cemeteries may have become unrecognizable through neglect. Farms, parks and graceful tree-lined avenues have had an easier time being incorporated into our standard preservation vocabulary. Some designed landscapes, particularly those of the recent past, do not always command the respect given the work of Frederick Law Olmsted or others of long-established reputations. For example, the nation’s first pedestrian shopping mall, the Fresno Mall designed by Garrett Eckbo, is currently at risk. Preservationists need to become familiar with the names of landscape architects from the recent past, such as Ruth Patricia Shellhorn, Dewey Donnell and Ralph Cornell, in addition to Lawrence Halprin and Tommy Church.

The Survey and National Register programs at the Office of Historic Preservation have been evolving as understanding of the importance of landscapes has improved. New surveys and new nominations should now take into account the possibility of cultural landscapes as significant features of whatever property is under consideration. Old surveys and nominations may need to be re-visited to include previously overlooked landscapes. As an example, three nominations for Torrey Pines State Park properties in the 1990s said little about Ralph Cornell’s landscape planning work there. Ideally, many mining and agricultural properties should be looked at again to include significant landscape features and relationships.

Once recognized, landscapes need to be treated in a sensitive manner that recognizes both the evolution of the property and the need to maintain its historicity and authenticity. Carrying capacity also needs to be critically examined. Those preserving parks and streetscapes need to develop sophistication in their treatment. “Historic” streetlights and similar amenities out of a catalogue may not be appropriate for the property’s period of significance.

The state faces many challenges and obstacles to the preservation of its important cultural landscapes. However, the programs of the Office of Historic Preservation offer some opportunities to combat the erosion of these extremely valuable resources.

## IV. HERITAGE TOURISM

In recent decades, the subject of heritage tourism has gained increasing attention nationally, among historic preservationists, the travel and tourism industry, and those concerned with revitalization of economically distressed areas that also include substantial numbers of historic properties. Since the California Comprehensive Statewide Historic Preservation Plan was last updated in 2000, interest in heritage tourism has increased dramatically. Most notably, OHP's two main federal partners the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the NPS have embraced heritage tourism as principal focuses for their activities. The NPS, for example, has launched a major web site feature, "Travel Itineraries," focusing on National Register-listed sites as heritage tourism destinations. The Advisory Council launched its "Preserve America" program, geared chiefly toward promoting heritage tourism.

There is ample statistical basis for touting the economic advantages of heritage tourism. Travel industry officials generally treat heritage tourism as part of a larger category, called cultural tourism, which includes visitation to historic sites as well as museums and other venues of arts and history. Most statistics pertaining to heritage tourism are contained within that larger category. Studies from the Travel Industry Association of America (TIA) and *Smithsonian Magazine* show growing interest in travelers' desire to experience artistic, cultural and historic activities. Study results, as reported in *The Historic/Cultural Traveler, 2003 Edition,* show that a remarkable 81 percent of U.S. adults who traveled in the past year, or 118 million, are considered historic/cultural travelers. These travelers included historical or cultural activities on almost 217 million person-trips last year, up 13 percent from 192 million in 1996.

Historic/cultural travelers spend 38 percent more per trip (average $623 vs. $457, excluding cost of transportation) and stay 38 percent longer away from home than do other travelers. Thirty percent of historic/cultural travelers say they were influenced to visit given destinations by specific historic or cultural events or activities. Many historic/cultural travelers (39 percent) say trips that include cultural, arts, historic, or heritage activities or events are more enjoyable and 38 percent prefer to visit destinations that have some historical significance. Three in ten (29 percent) agree that it is important that their vacation or leisure trips include cultural experiences. A total of 26 percent felt that a leisure or vacation trip away from home is not complete without visiting a museum, historic site or landmark or attending a cultural event or arts performance (17 percent). Cultural and heritage tourism are increasing, influenced by older travelers who increasingly seek enriching experiences in interesting, scenic and inviting places. They are motivated to better understand the places they visit and the cultures and events that formed those destinations.

Further, the spending and contributions of travelers at and near cultural and heritage resources help supplement the financial capabilities of local economies and populations. Tourist spending provides both direct support to cultural and heritage venues and it increases public and private support and preservation by demonstrating the economic and social importance of the cultural or heritage venue to communities.

California stands to benefit from the growth of cultural and heritage tourism both because of its rich heritage and its position as a travel destination. California is the most visited state in the nation with nearly 11 percent of all trips in the U.S. taken here. This huge volume of travel supports a $75 billion/year industry, employing over 900,000 Californians and contributing nearly $5 billion in tax revenues; virtually every county in California benefits economically from cultural and heritage tourism. Clearly, travel and tourism is a pillar of the California economy, but it also greatly benefits our society and culture beyond economics.

The TIA survey shows clearly that heritage tourism is fulfilling a deep-seated desire on the part of a majority of American people, as stated in a heritage tourism study by the National Trust for Historic Preservation, “to experience the places, artifacts, and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the past and present.” It has also demonstrated a tremendous opportunity for increased income to regions of the state that include marketable historic resources.

Heritage tourism is a challenge, however, because tourism professionals and historic preservation professionals have rarely communicated well. Tourism officials are familiar with the business of marketing tourism destinations but are generally unfamiliar with the prerequisites for an “authentic” historic experience. Historic preservationists, on the other hand, are experienced in identifying and nurturing an “authentic” historic experience but are generally unfamiliar with the business of tourism marketing. An effective heritage tourism program will require greater cooperation between these two groups of professionals.

Heritage tourism is also a challenge from a jurisdictional standpoint. OHP and state tourism officials are best positioned to encourage heritage tourism on a regional or statewide basis; tourism locally is best handled by local convention and visitor bureau (CVBs) or merchants’ associations, including Main Street programs. A regional or statewide focus, however, raises questions of how the state can manage a heritage tourism-marketing program, faced with the need to coordinate activities with many different jurisdictions. Local CVBs and other promotional groups often see themselves as competing for scarce tourism dollars and are disinclined to cooperate, even though regional marketing will likely result in increased tourist activity for all historic communities within a region. Overcoming these localistic tendencies will prove a challenge for any marketing program that attempts to market beyond strictly local boundaries.

For about a year, a group of cultural planners and coordinators for various agencies in California have been meeting under the umbrella group called the California Cultural

and Heritage Tourism Council (Council). Headed by officials from the Department of Parks and Recreation and Tourism Commission, the Council has explored various alternatives for promoting heritage tourism on a regional basis. Also participating in the council are the NPS, the Bureau of Land Management, the California Department of Transportation, the Forest Service, and other agencies that own and maintain heritage resources in California.

The general conclusion of the Council is that heritage tourism is best promoted on a "heritage corridor" basis. The Council has tentatively identified Highway 49 – the Golden Chain Highway that links dozens of historic Gold Rush communities – as a primary focus. The Council will apply for grants from various state, federal, and non-profit sources to develop capital assets (such as visitor centers) and marketing program, designed to call attention to the region as a heritage tourism destination.

## V. INCENTIVES FOR PRESERVATION

The rehabilitation and preservation of historic properties occurs every day throughout California. This work may involve everything from minor repairs by homeowners of historic homes to large scale rehabilitations of commercial property. Many of these projects may be eligible for some kind of economic incentive that would benefit not only the historic property but help to improve the quality of life throughout the surrounding community. However, an important divide among preservation projects may be between large and small projects. Larger projects usually involve investors who can utilize indirect and or long term financing and a multitude of incentives. These projects can also afford the variety of consultants necessary to get a project through the regulatory process. However, these projects do not constitute the majority of preservation work done in California. For the most part, while the typical homeowner or small commercial owner may be left out of the incentives arena, they may be caught up in the regulatory process.

The benefits of historic preservation are widely publicized in terms of aesthetics, cultural, and social impacts, however the economic benefits are less documented and publicized. The fact that preservation work can leverage significant amounts of private capital, create local jobs, and stimulate economic activities including heritage tourism provides a strong basis for support of existing and new incentives. One common denominator for these historic projects is typically conformance of the work with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties which ensures consistent quality standards for preservation, rehabilitation, restoration and reconstruction.

Day to day preservation work on a local level may involve a variety of home repairs, including the perennial threat of using replacement materials in lieu of repairing original features and materials in-kind. While outreach and education are important to the preservation cause and maintaining historic integrity, merely providing helpful hints and insight into the benefits of retaining original materials, such as windows, don't provide

any direct financial benefit. Likewise, although a link between the retention of historic fabric and the resulting increase in home value to a home can be documented, it provides no immediate incentive to the owner to do the right thing unless required to by a local design review body.

An additional burden on preservation projects in California apart from other states remains the high cost of land, a volatile real estate market and additional project costs associated with the retrofitting or upgrading to acceptable code requirements, whether it is seismic or fire/life safety work, of older buildings.

So what can be done to encourage and facilitate preservation at the local level? One response is to look for low-cost or no-cost incentives to encourage preservation during tough economic times. Local governments throughout California have the authority to implement incentives that not only promote preservation but also energize downtown areas and depressed neighborhoods, and encourage the rehabilitation of historic properties. These incentives may range from regulatory relief from compliance with current building codes to zoning-based incentives such as variances or fee waivers.

*Economics*

The primary incentives for historic properties in California remain the 20% Federal Rehabilitation Tax Credit and the state sponsored Mills Act Property Tax Abatement Program.

Since 1976, the National Park Service has administered the Preservation Tax Incentives program in partnership with the Internal Revenue Service and with State Historic Preservation Offices. The Federal tax credit is most utilized in the state's larger metropolitan areas such as Los Angeles, San Francisco, and San Diego.

In fiscal year 2004, the National Park Service approved 1,200 projects representing an estimated $3.88 billion of private investment spent to restore and adapt historic buildings - an increase of 42% over the previous year's expenditure record and the highest in program history. California ranked 8$^{th}$ in the country in the amount of investments certified for the FY 2004 with total investments of $102,782,333 divided among 10 projects that included rental housing, retail and office space, conversion of commercial space to housing, hotel use, and an opera house. The Tax Credit Program remains an important preservation incentive program that promotes the adaptive reuse of historic commercial buildings, creates employment in the construction industry, and stimulates the tax base of local communities.

The Federal 20% Rehabilitation Tax Credit has been actively used in California. From 1978 to 2004:

- A total of 331 projects have used the credits with a cumulative qualified rehabilitation cost of $1,061,194,654.

- Approximately 54 percent of the certified rehabilitation projects were located in 4 counties: Los Angeles (74 projects), San Francisco (50 projects), San Diego (36 projects), and Alameda (20 projects). In all, 36 of California's 58 counties contain rehabilitation projects that have filed for the Federal tax credit.
- The median cost of a California Federal tax credit project is $ 879,000, and the average cost is $ 3,206,025.

Fiscal year 2004 yielded an increase in the tax credit program activity attributed in part to favorable market financing for real estate development and an increase in public awareness of the benefits of the tax incentives program. However, the number of projects for California actually dropped.

The Mills Act is single most important economic incentive program available in California for use by private property owners of qualified historic buildings. Owner-occupied single family residences and income-producing commercial property may qualify for the program if it is available in their area. The jurisdictions with the most active Mills Act programs are San Diego, Los Angeles and San Jose. As a result of current state economic conditions, the Mills Act is currently being scrutinized by several County Assessors in an effort to increase revenues and lessen its benefits to owners of historic properties.

Although not an outright financial incentive, the California Historical Building Code provides alternative measures for qualified historic buildings that frequently result in rehabilitation cost savings. An Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) credit and deduction provides savings for making any commercial use building accessible.

Other incentives available to historic properties in California include Community Development Block Grants (CDBG), TEA-21 Enhancement funds, the state Seismic Retrofit Property Tax Exclusion, the California Heritage Fund and the Main Street Program.

Local incentives also provide increasing benefits to stimulating inner city neighborhoods and their historic buildings. Transfer of development rights, zoning and planning incentives, and grant and loan programs can provide economic stimulus at the local government level.

The full benefit of some incentives is not known however, since the 10% rehabilitation credit, low-income housing tax credit, charitable contributions for historic preservation purposes (easements), and local incentives are not monitored or tracked by OHP or coordinated by any preservation entity.

As public perception of the benefits of historic preservation grows, and new movements such as sustainability, the greening of buildings, and smart growth become increasingly part of the common construction vocabulary with varying objectives, it is important for preservation to become an equally partner in the development and construction fields. The Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) movement also presents an

opportunity to promote historic preservation. Partnership with the current rating system needs to be developed to provide more incentives for the reuse and rehabilitation of historic buildings, inherently green by design.

Housing remains a key planning issue in downtown areas and one of the most important uses for rehabilitated historic buildings. As development and planning communities rethink residential and mixed use development, infill, and investments in downtown, it also becomes increasingly important to retain affordable housing in those downtown districts, particularly for long term residents. The revitalization of existing housing stock and the addition of housing in downtown areas stimulate activity 24 hours a day which is a common denominator in successful city cores.

A persuasive link between preservation and land use remains the savings available to communities through the incorporation and reuse of existing infrastructure versus new development which can be documented. Expanded services such as increased services, utility extensions, new streets and improvements and traffic congestion caused by the spread of new development can also be clearly documented.

But reuse of historic buildings in urban cores isn't just for housing. Another economic benefit remains small business incubation. For small firms that may not be able to afford rents in newer or larger buildings, historic buildings provide an attractive alternative. Further, the existing conditions in an historic building may be more conducive and more appropriate for a small firm that may not require an open floor plate and can best utilize the typical older building floor plates and configuration. Downtown revitalization is happening. Today's trend of downtown living is mostly occurring in historic buildings and is becoming common in such cities as San Francisco and Los Angeles where whole historic districts are being rediscovered.

*State Tax Credit*

One of the most important incentives that could help to energize the revitalization of historic buildings and neighborhoods is the development of a state tax credit for individual homeowners or owners of small commercial properties. More than 20 states currently have a state credit of some kind. The credit typically offers a percentage of qualified rehabilitation expenditures against state income or single business tax liability. Programs may involve a maximum cap on project credits, an annual ceiling on aggregate credits, and limit the type (residential or commercial) of eligible projects.

*The Future*

Statistics and facts with real life examples need to be compiled to further promote the economic benefits of preservation. This information is imperative to encourage local historic preservation efforts and gain legislative support for statewide incentives and funding. OHP is frequently asked for statistical information on cost savings, lists of successful projects, examples of specific types of rehabilitation uses, developers, and savings achieved through the use of existing incentives. Unfortunately, due to existing

database limitations, and staffing and funding constraints, any additional means of tracking and record keeping for statistical purposes is not performed. A study, similar to ones compiled in many other states, is needed to collect data and case studies that document the dollar savings or rehabilitation versus new development, increases in property tax and property values following rehabilitation and neighborhood improvements. This study could not currently be performed by existing staff.

During times of economic uncertainty it is unlikely that any measures that reduce revenues would gain legislative support. However, it may be the right time to develop these incentives, rally the troops, and be prepared and ready for the opportune time to launch additional incentives that would protect, preserve, and rehabilitate California's historic properties for future generations.

## VI. INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Along with the presence of the many historical resources in California comes a tremendous volume of information that must be managed and made available to the public. Information management is a foundation of the successful execution of OHP's duties and responsibilities in helping to identify, manage, and protect historical resources. Although it is convenient to think of "information management" as a set of computer hardware, data, programs, and the methods for using and accessing them, the term covers a much broader range of issues and activities. Information resides in uncountable locations in a great and ever-increasing number of formats and media. Whether by word of mouth, handwritten note, typed form, or processed electronic data, the nonstop production and flow of information on historical resources in California is beyond the means of any one agency or group to manage. Despite this, OHP must fulfill its role as the primary keeper of a statewide inventory of historical resources. Along with this responsibility come the need and the authority to determine how information is captured, what information is kept, what is discarded, and how the information is accessed and represented - all in the context of statewide resource management.

Ultimately, the information in OHP's inventory belongs to the people of California - but not all information is provided to all individuals. The California Public Records Act exempts information on archaeological resources in OHP inventory from public disclosure requirements. State law, however, does not specify under what conditions and to whom the information should be disclosed. Deciding what information to release to whom, and when to release it, is a constant challenge that requires consideration of resource protection, fairness to those seeking information, and the concerns of those whose heritage is represented in part by those resources. Rather than avoiding, ignoring or over-simplifying the situation that arises out of often-conflicting desires and priorities of stakeholders in the resource management realm, OHP must continually seek interaction and resolution with those who have concerns about how information is provided to it users, including the public.

OHP manages and provides access to historical resource information through the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS). The CHRIS is an organization comprised of the State Historical Resources Commission, OHP, and Information Centers (ICs). The twelve ICs, located primarily at Universities and Colleges, operate under contract on behalf of OHP. Each IC manages information for a region in California. They provide access to, interpretation of, and education about this information to a broad base of public and private clients.

Although every IC operates under a contract and is guided by the same business rules, each IC has its own abilities, needs, and issues. Additionally, development of CHRIS information management standards has proceeded at a fairly slow pace. When standards are developed, not every IC is in a position to comply with them in a timely fashion. Therefore, while the user or client experience at one IC might be very similar to their experience at another, this is usually not the case. As a result, many users of the CHRIS must familiarize themselves with the different operations at multiple ICs, making access to, and use and exchange of information more complicated than is desirable. Due to the importance of access to regularly updated historical resource information, this situation likely increases the overall cost of historical resource management and planning.

Information on historical resources does not pass through the hands of its users and managers in a linear fashion. Rather, there is a constantly changing set of information on historical resources that passes through a “web” of information users and managers. An agency or individual may be a consumer of information in one context, and a provider in another. This role exchange applies to all parties that are either part of or users of the CHRIS. In proceeding with an information management plan, OHP must acknowledge and address the interdependence of public agencies, private entities, and individuals that use and maintain historical resource information.

Historical resource information exists in various digital and non-digital formats, and users and managers of the CHRIS must contend with quite a bit of format and content variation. For instance, while there is one series of DPR 523 forms that are the official documents for recording historical resources, there are multiple versions of that form series in use today. In many cases, information that finds its way into OHP inventory is not recorded on a 523 form at all. Also, while some users of the forms may maintain the resource information in a database, others may store the forms as word processing files, and others may use handwritten forms with no digital copies. Dealing with these different information formats and the different versions of the forms requires additional time for all information users and managers. While it may be beyond the abilities of the CHRIS to drastically improve this situation in the immediate future, it is an issue that calls for attention and action.

The tools and methods available to the CHRIS for information management are constantly changing, due to factors including technological advancement, changes in available funds, and evolving responsibilities that require redirection/reallocation of staff and funds. As a rule, the practice of historical resource management now involves the

use of modern technologies, allowing information to be managed and accessed in ways that weren't possible or feasible several years ago. The CHRIS has not kept up with these changes. The 1997 and 2000 State Plans emphasized the need for improving the management and increasing the fiscal support of the CHRIS. Efforts by OHP to increase funding to the ICs have been largely unsuccessful. As a result, the ICs rely on their own income to fund the majority of their work. They, along with OHP, are often unable to address or effectively implement steps to standardize or modernize their operations, and often must focus their activities and decisions on maintaining adequate income to continue basic operation. Periodically, agreements with government agencies or other entities provide additional income focused on specific projects or geographic areas. While this type of income supports modernization of the CHRIS, it does not address support of day-to-day activities and maintenance of data or IT systems. At the very least, the funding situation has greatly delayed modernization and improvement of information management and related business practices within the CHRIS.

While OHP is required to maintain a statewide inventory, all entities charged with managing historical resources maintain their own inventories in some fashion. In many cases, government agencies have developed processes and computer applications that are managed almost independently of the CHRIS inventory. Sometimes, this occurs out of necessity. Other times, it may be that OHP has not successfully communicated and partnered with an agency, making integration of information management procedures impossible. Different agencies' priorities and timelines do not necessarily coincide, so OHP must seek ways to compromise with and address multiple needs of agencies, each at a different level and rate of information technology adoption and use. As keepers of California's statewide historical resources inventory, OHP and the ICs are responsible for setting the tone and taking the lead in matters relating to historical resource management. This responsibility includes communication and coordination with other agencies or entities that carry out similar information management duties at the regional or local level. As part of this coordination, redundant, contradictory, and incompatible databases should be avoided whenever possible. At risk is the accurate, consistent, collection and use of information, and ultimately, the resources themselves. Keeping the CHRIS inventory up-to-date and accurate is a fundamental OHP and IC need, and yet this cannot be done simply through internal practices and decisions made at OHP and the ICs alone. Every citizen bears some burden in managing resources, and has a concomitant right to see and understand what resources exist, how they are being managed, and to play a role in defining how information management shall change to meet the needs of its citizens and their historical resources.

The growth of the Internet presents opportunities in that great amounts of information can be shared all over the world and from one location to another in seconds. This is also a problem, as the pace of information dissemination outstrips or bypasses the dialog and interaction between managers and users of information. Additionally the security of confidential information about historical resources becomes a larger issue when viewed in a worldwide, digital context. Just as the CHRIS has struggled to keep pace with technological advances, users of the CHRIS may not always have the latest tools to maximize access and use of information. Keeping up-to-date with technology,

while not placing excessive demands on users of information to keep up, requires a balanced approach to planning and decision making. These issues all are key to the future of OHP and the CHRIS.

Overall, historical resource information management presents many challenges and opportunities to OHP. Clearly, with funding and effective planning, support, and implementation, many improvements in management of the CHRIS inventory may be accomplished. Choices must be made that result in effective information management in the present, but that will also allow for and enhance effective, efficient, secure, and affordable information management in the future.

## VII. LAND USE PLANNING

During the 20th century, California experienced tremendous population growth; in the past 50 years, the population more than tripled. California has added more than a half million new residents each year since the 2000 Census. Present projections are that the state's population will grow by more than 11 million people, from 34.5 million in 2000 to 45.8 million in 2020. Many older communities have deteriorating infrastructure while newer communities developing in the suburbs are having difficulty meeting the infrastructure demands of new residents. Housing is in short supply at high prices. Poverty is increasing most quickly in developing suburbs. Farmland and open space are disappearing to make way for low-density urbanized developments outside of cities and towns. Traffic congestion is increasing and longer commutes are the result of affordable housing being in short supply and far removed from job centers.

State leadership and widespread public concern over the state's growth and its potential consequences have resulted in several studies and initiatives to identify the contributing factors and develop policy recommendations and pragmatic, effective solutions for addressing the challenges of California's growth. A growing consensus among business, academic, government, social equity, labor, and environmental leaders and land use planning professionals is that smart growth strategies must be implemented at local, regional and state levels if California is to accommodate projected growth while preserving people's quality of life. Smart growth strategies are based on planning principles compatible with historic preservation values and practices.

In fact, historic preservation an important tools for smart growth. The recognition that we can no longer afford to waste our resources, whether financial, natural, or human, relates directly to the preservation and adaptive reuse of the material resources and human labor represented by historic building stock and infrastructure. The smart growth principle values mixed use, pedestrian-oriented developments using existing infrastructure and can fit with adaptive reuse and revitalization of historic downtowns and neighborhoods. Smart growth recognizes the economic values of promoting small business; older and historic buildings and business districts are ideal candidates for and encourage the development of diverse small businesses. In contrast to new construction, rehabilitation of older buildings and historic neighborhoods creates jobs for

local workers and business for local merchants. Reinvestment in historic building stock translates into multiplied economic benefits resulting from downtown revitalization, heritage tourism, affordable as well as luxury housing, preservation of agricultural lands and open spaces, decreased costs for landfill from demolition waste disposal, maintenance of existing infrastructure rather than costs of new infrastructure, etc.

California's population expansion and economic growth create development pressures that threaten historic resources including prehistoric and historical archeological sites, historic housing stock, and historic rural landscapes and agricultural resources as well as cultural landscapes and traditional cultural properties. The goal of every community should be to preserve that special sense of time and place and cultural and social diversity created by its historic buildings, neighborhoods, and landscapes. All too often historic designation is seen as limiting property rights and historic preservation is viewed as a deterrent to development. This may be the result of the emphasis in the past on historic designation rather than on the development of a comprehensive approach to integrating historic preservation values and strategies into land-use planning and economic development.

Local governments in California are required to adopt general plans that include seven specified elements. As of 2004, only 91 of California's 550 plus cities and counties had included the optional historic preservation element in their general plans; 166 jurisdictions have a historical resources commission or committee, 47 cities and four counties are Certified Local Governments. As these numbers indicate, historic preservation is not well integrated into local government planning.

In November 2003, the Los Angeles Conservancy published "the Los Angeles County Preservation Report Card" in which local governments were graded on their efforts and the tools they use to ensure the "preservation of historic and cultural resources that are in private hands. Of the 89 jurisdictions within Los Angeles County, only eight meet the federal preservation standards to be Certified Local Governments (CLGs), fewer than half have ever performed a comprehensive historical resources survey, and most had "no meaningful regulatory tools to protect historic landmarks beyond CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) requirements." Six cities received a grade of A or A-; 39 were graded as C or D; and 46 were tagged "preservation truants" because they have no legal protections for privately owned historic resources.

The LA Conservancy concluded their report:

> *"Our ideal city would have the ability to designate landmarks and historic districts without owner consent, and to protect those resources absolutely against unnecessary demolition or inappropriate alteration…would participate in the Certified Local government program and have an active Mills Act Historic Property Contracts program…have a qualified cultural Resources Commission, a trained staff to handle preservation issues and administer designation programs, and a completed comprehensive historic resources inventory with a plan for continuing updates.*

*The ideal city would also have tools few or no cities in Los Angeles County have currently adopted…including economic incentives such as programs guaranteeing property tax rebate for historic preservation projects, state income tax credits for the rehabilitation of historic properties, and grants or low interest loans for the repair or restoration of historic properties; city funded public programs…that actively advocate for, promote, and provide advice and assistance for the preservation of historic resources; city housing and community redevelopment programs that fund the restoration of historic residential buildings to create affordable and dignified housing alternatives; and city real estate banking programs that discourage demolition by neglect and encourage the revitalization of historic properties."*

Although local planners, planning commissioners and other local officials have a wealth of information available to better understand planning laws and issues, little attention in these materials is given to historic preservation. The League of California Cities lists several broad topics relevant to planning issues but historic preservation is not among them. The Planning Commissioner's Handbook, developed by the Institute for Local Self Government and updated in 2004, addresses historic preservation in four brief paragraphs. The Local Government Commission, committed to making communities "more livable, prosperous and resource-efficient" in accordance with the Ahwahnee Principles for urban and suburban planning, provides no substantive references or information relevant to historic preservation or its importance in land use planning.

Further evidence of the need to reach and educate a larger audience about the benefits of integrating historic preservation into local land use planning comes from responses to the State Plan Needs Assessment Survey. Garnering 51 percent, "integrating historic preservation into land use planning" was the highest ranked single issue in response to the survey question asking which activities OHP should focus on in the next five years. Survey results also placed a strong emphasis on providing technical assistance to local historic preservation commissions and providing review of CEQA documents.

In response to the question of which preservation activities typically performed by other groups or agencies, should OHP promote, the top ten answers involve local governments in one way or another. When asked to identify the major threats to historical resources four of the top five answers identified land use problems. As to tools, "local historic preservation ordinances and commissions" with "local zoning regulations" were also highly ranked. Additionally, a number of the comments also spoke to the importance of educating and assisting local governments to understand the processes (including CEQA) and benefits of integrating historic preservation into land use planning.

In dealing with archaeological resources, the gap between standards used in federal project review and local agency review has widened. The archaeological resources encountered in local projects are often the same or similar to those encountered in local

and in federal projects. The care used in surveying, evaluating, and treating those resources should also be similar if not identical.

Recent natural disasters such as the Paso Robles earthquake and fires in Southern California in 2003 as well as homeland security issues have emphasized the importance of identifying, evaluating and understanding historic resources at the local level in order to provide an appropriate emergency response. This emphasis can protect these resources before they are damaged or destroyed by disaster response efforts or pressing security needs.

Historic preservation takes place (or fails to) primarily at the local level. There, concerned citizens and property owners, preservation advocates, and elected officials and other local government decision-makers work together to recognize, preserve, and appropriately utilize the historical assets of the community by integrating preservation planning strategies and programs into the broader land use planning processes. OHP's goals and objectives for the next five years will be focused on fostering and strengthening regulatory, advocacy, and educational efforts to that end.

## VIII. OUTREACH AND PUBLIC EDUCATION

Outreach and public education is and continues to be an important component of all of OHP's program areas. OHP staff members regularly provide special training and participate in workshops in collaboration with the California Preservation Foundation. When requested and as time permits, staff also provide special training and present educational programs to local governments, college classes, and community-based preservation organizations. Additionally, OHP has made all of its technical assistance bulletins and other program information available online. Workshop training materials including PowerPoint presentations are also available online. OHP's web site provides links to other state and federal agencies and organizations with programs relevant to historic preservation.

In spite of these efforts, the need for OHP to reach out to local governments and citizen groups to provide technical assistance and leadership is reiterated repeatedly in the answers and comments given in the survey. One comment put it, "OHP needs to be a stronger agency in California, a go-to source for historic preservation information, cultural tourism how-to's and a public information agency for the general public." Another comment was, "historic preservation needs to become a widely visible issue, not just something for the literary/historically inclined or for an exclusive group of experts. If this is part of a huge statewide initiative, lots of media coverage would be beneficial."

Training for historic preservation commissioners and planning departments are two of the needs identified in the survey. More widespread education about the benefits and methodologies of preservation for the general public was also identified as a need, along with more education about the standards and guidelines for compliance with both

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and CEQA. Survey responses suggest that OHP needs to develop more materials and programs and provide more training to a wider audience than is presently served. OHP could make a far more active effort in its outreach to private developers who seek Tax Act dividends, particularly for projects in small cities and counties that historically have not participated in this program. OHP could also actively extend its outreach program to all cities and counties that have not in the past been active in the larger preservation program, particularly the counties in the Great Central Valley. These efforts would better educate and assist citizens, local government decision-makers, and cultural resource consultants in meeting the challenges and opportunities for historic preservation within their communities and the state.

## IX. PRESERVING THE RECENT PAST

At the end of World War II, all of America, but especially California, entered into a prolonged state of economic growth and development, which resulted in the construction of millions of new buildings and structures in California. Because she grew faster than any other part of the nation in the era, California was the trend-setter in post-war architecture and design. Many of these part-war resources are now achieving the National Park Service minimal 50 year definition of historic and all of the rest of the nation is looking to California to provide leadership in how to survey, evaluate, and manage these resources, which collectively represent the majority of the buildings and structures in the state.

To its credit, the State Historical Resources Commission of California has created a task force to address this specific issue. That task force has held hearings and symposia across the state to gather public input on what, within the vast vocabulary of post-war resources, deserves priority treatment in the historic preservation program of the state.

The National Park Service has also been active in this field. Recognizing the need to address the issue of preserving the recent past, the National Park Service organized two conferences, one in 1995 and another in 2000, focused on preservation of twentieth-century resources. Two publications came out of those conferences. The first, *Preserving the Recent Past*, examined the evaluation and preservation of twentieth-century resources in a collection of seventy-one papers. *Preserving the Recent Past 2* added nearly sixty papers on the evaluation, planning, and preservation strategies, and technology, conservation and rehabilitation of twentieth-century structures and material.

At the turn of the 21st century, a vast new landscape of property types approached the fifty-year mark. Such property types as auto and roadside related properties including motels, hotels, restaurants, cocktail lounges; subdivisions and tract housing; cold war properties, corporate architecture; and modern landscapes reflecting the aesthetic values, technological developments, and rapidly changing and diversifying cultures of the mid-twentieth century were now old enough for consideration as potentially

significant historic resources.

After World War II, the United States was recognized as the international leader in modern architecture. Richard Longstreth wrote in his essay in the March 1995 publication of *Preserving the Recent Past*, "The legacy of work by a wide range of highly creative designers of landscapes and interiors as well as buildings during the postwar era is probably unmatched by any other single nation. Also included is a broad range in the vernacular realm." As stated in *Preserving our Recent Past,* the best known buildings of the recent past are "recognized as works of art and icons of their time. But the story of the recent past cannot be told through the icons alone. Many other, less prominent, places are important to a community's sense of identity and memory. Local architectural firms, builders, entrepreneurs, and artists helped shape the 20th century landscape by adapting national and international trends to fit local needs. These buildings and sites have no assurance they will survive."

Survival is in question because while many want to preserve the places that best exemplify the events, people, and the designs of engineering and technological achievement of the recent past, much more research and documentation is needed to establish the context upon which to build consensus about which persons, events, designs, or infrastructures are historically significant. H. Ward Jandl's introductory paper in the March 1995 publication of *Preserving the Recent Past* identified some of the issues facing preservationists in documenting, evaluating, and conserving theses historic resources of the twentieth century. One issue is the lack of a broad body of information and knowledge about their history, significance, and care.

The general public and even some preservation professionals are not convinced that the recent past needs to be protected. Personal taste in architecture can outweigh the more legitimate criteria for the determination of historic significance of buildings. Buildings of the recent past are frequently regarded as awkward and obsolete. Since the initial construction, population growth and change, paid mortgages, expended depreciation, expired leases, and rapidly rising land prices have accelerated the threats to these resources of the recent past; many original coffee shops, gas stations and shopping malls will not last fifty years.

In California the demolition in recent years of buildings by master architects Edward Durrell Stone, Richard Neutra, and Rudolf Schindler, to name a few, has heightened the sense of urgency for the need to study and better understand the cultural resources of the Modern Age. Although several historic preservation organizations in California are making significant contributions in the identification and registration of mid-century resources, more needs to be done. As noted in *Preserving the Recent Past,* "Like 19th century main streets, buildings and neighborhoods from the recent past that are preserved encourage further economic development. Historic tax credits and other incentives can assist with these efforts. The 20th century's distinctive places need to survive not only for economic potential, or beauty, or fame, but also because they provide a continuous thread to past lives and times. These buildings, from skyscrapers to supermarkets, deserve our attention."